



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/824,491 | 04/02/2001 | Wayne W. Wang | 13160US03 | 9379 |

7590

06/03/2005

Jeffrey D. Wheeler
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
P.O. Box #061080
Chicago, IL 60606-1080

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

BASEHOAR, ADAM L

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2178

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/824,491

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

Adam L Basehoar

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

RD

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 03/14/05 to the original Application filed on 04/02/01 to which claims priority to Provisional application 60232448, filed on 09/12/00.
2. The rejection of claim 1 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph has been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.
3. The rejection of Claims 1-22 remain under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiarto et al (US-6,278,449 08/21/04) in view of Jamtgaard et al (US-6,430,624 08/06/02) further in view of Keane et al (US-5,481,710 01/02/96).
4. Claims 1-22 are pending in this case. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiarto et al (US-6,278,449 08/21/04) in view of Jamtgaard et al (US-6,430,624 08/06/02) further in view of Keane et al (US-5,481,710 01/02/96).

-In regard to independent claim 1, Sugiarto teaches displaying a source page (Fig. 3: 326, 328, 330 & Fig. 5: 500) and a template page (Fig. 3: 324 & Fig. 5: 570) using a graphical user interface (Fig. 3 & 5);

identifying elements within the information displayed on the source page and the template page (Fig. 3: 334, 336, 338 & Fig. 5: 505)(column 6, lines 10-20);

recording user actions for arranging the elements on the source page and the template page (column 6, lines 10-40 & columns 7-8, lines 55-30), the user actions being recorded into memory of the configuration file;

generating a chain of elements from the at least two stacks (i.e. the full listing of user added and deleted elements from various web pages to the target page)(column 6, lines 10-25);

and generating the set of transform rules (i.e. the completed configuration file)(column 6, 27-33) from the source page (Fig. 3: 326, 328, 330 & Fig. 5: 500) according to the source page URL (Fig. 5: 515)(column 5, lines 61-63) and the receiving device (Fig. 1: 6).

Sugiarto also teaches wherein the standard source page format would be in HTML and thus the configuration file and transform rules would be in HTML (column 3, lines 53-57).

Sugiarto does not teach generating XSLT from the generated chains and thus generating the transform rules in part from the XSLT. Jamtgaard et al content delivery system teaches where XML was a language designed especially for web documents to permit re-formatting on fly of HTML or XML web pages to other formats (column 2, lines 12-17). Jamtgaard et al also teach utilizing XSL for processing the XML documents from format to another (column 7, lines 55-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Sugiarto to have employed XSLT as a processing option, because Jamtgaard et al teaches that

Art Unit: 2178

XML was a well known form of web documents to be converted for different information appliances and that XSLT was a notoriously well known standard (<http://www.w3c.org>) for transforming those documents to the necessary formats to be rendered on the different information appliances, all of which would have allowed Sugiarto access to all XML documents on the web for formatting and display.

Sugiarto teaches wherein the user actions where stored in memory as the configuration file. Sugiarto does not teach wherein the user actions where recorded on two stacks and with certain stacks being associated with certain user actions. Keane teaches wherein user actions are stored on two stacks and where certain user actions are stored with certain stacks (i.e. redo actions stored on redo stack and the undo actions stored on the undo stack)(column 1, lines 32-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Sugiarto to have employed the method of storing user actions on two stacks as shown in Keane, because Keane teaches by doing so a user can retrace their user actions by adding functionality to redo and undo actions (Summary of Invention).

-In regard to dependent claims 5-8, Sugiarto teaches providing a user interface displayed on a browser that includes two frames (Fig. 3: 324, 326, 328, 330 & Fig. 5: 505, 570), a left and right frame (Fig. 3: 324, 326, 328, 330 & Fig. 5: 505, 570), wherein the template page was loaded onto the left frame (Fig. 3: 324) and the source page is loaded on the right frame (Fig. 3: 326, 328). Sugiarto also teaches including an identifier (element content)(Fig. 5: 505) and path information (element's source web page URL)(column 5: 515) as attributes of each element in

Art Unit: 2178

the two pages (i.e. URL and Element Content are both attributes of every element within the source page and template page).

-In regard to dependent claims 2-4 and 10-11, Sugiarto as taught above in claims 1, does not teach a redo stack and an undo stack, wherein the user actions included redo and undo. Sugiarto also does not teach wherein created changes included a delete chain and a sequence change. Keane teaches a redo stack and an undo stack (column 1, lines 48-51), wherein the user actions include undo and redo (Fig. 2: 31). Keane also teaches wherein created changes include a deleted chain (equivalent to a redo chain of events) and a sequence chain (equivalent to an undo chain of events)(columns 1-2, 53-17). Keane also teaches wherein the Undo button cancels the last user action and wherein the Redo button restores the last Undo action (column 2, lines 1-17). In addition to the redo and undo functionality being notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention (column 1, lines 10-29), it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Sugiarto to employ the redo and undo stack functionality as detailed above, because Keane teaches adding redo and undo chaining functionality allows all users to utilize data which without such functionality would be lost (Background & Summary of Invention).

-In regard to dependent claims 9 and 12-13, Sugiarto teaches a plurality of buttons including ViewXSLT (equivalent to the "Refresh Target" button (Fig. 6: 625)) and Finish (equivalent to the "Save" button (Fig. 5: 525)). Sugiarto does not teach two additional buttons Undo and Redo. As discussed above in the rejections of claims 2-4 and 10-11, it would have

Art Unit: 2178

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Sugiarto to have included said two buttons, because Keane taught that said buttons would allow users to retrace their user actions by adding the well known functionality of redo and undo (Background & Summary of Invention)(Fig. Fig. 2: 31). Wherein the Finish button would generate the XSLT but not the RDF for the page, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have additionally generated RDF for the page, because by applicant's admission in the specification that RDF (page 12, 11-12) is a general framework for describing any internet resource such as web pages which was consistent with what was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

-In regard to dependent claims 14-22, Sugiarto teaches a standard user interface (Fig. 500) as well as traditional drag and drop functionality for editing the pages (columns 7-8, lines 56-10). Of the above claims that would not be cover by the drag and drop feature (i.e. based on a need for a keystroke), claims 16-22 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by what was notoriously well known in the art as keyboard shortcuts such as copy, paste, and cut (i.e. basic word processor functionality such as Microsoft Word 98, which encompassed the equivalent to the drag and drop functionality).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 03/14/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-In regard to independent claim 1, Applicant argues that Sugiarto does not teach recording user actions for arranging the elements on the source page and the template page. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant and believes Sugiarto clearly teaches recording user actions (i.e. user manipulation of elements on the source pages and the template page)(column 6, lines 10-40 & columns 7-8, lines 55-30)(Fig. 3), wherein the user actions were being recorded into memory of the configuration file. In this case the recorded user actions for arranging the elements on the pages are represented in the final user arranged placement of the elements in the configuration file.

Applicant also argues that Sugiarto does not teach generating the set of transform rules from the source page according to the source page URL. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant and believes Sugiarto clearly teaches generating the set of transform rules from the source page URL (column 5, lines 61-63). Indeed Sugiarto generates the transform rules saved in the complete configuration file in part from the user selected URL's from which to select the desired content. The claimed language does not preclude by which manner the source page URL was used to generate the transform rules.

Applicant finally argues that Sugiarto in view of Jamtgaard do not teach or suggest teach generating the set of transform rules from the source page according to...the XSLT. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Sugiarto in view of Jamtgaard in view of what was notoriously well known in the art relating to XML, XML, and XSLT, clearly teach providing XSLT from the generated chains and generating the transform rules in part from the XSLT. As discussed above in the rejection of the claims it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Sugiarto to have employed XSLT as a

Art Unit: 2178

processing option, because Jamtgaard et al teaches that XML was a well known form of web documents to be converted for different information appliances and that XSLT was a notoriously well known standard (<http://www.w3c.org>) for transforming those documents to the necessary formats to be rendered on the different information appliances, all of which would have provided Sugiarto the benefit of access to all XML documents on the web for formatting and display.

-In regard to independent claim 1, Applicant argues there is no motivation to combine the Sugiarto reference in view of the Jamtgaard and Keane references. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Sugiarto reference teaches a method to selectively edit a target display page by adding and deleting elements from other web pages. The Keane reference teaches wherein it would have been advantageous to record the user actions on two stacks to support the user actions to provide the well known functionality of undo/redo. Keane teaches that by providing this application program the Sugiarto reference would be provided the benefit of being able to retrace their own user actions through the added redo and undo functionality.

-In regard to dependent claims 16-22, Applicant challenges the Examiner's official notice in regard to each claim. The examiner wishes to note that an attempt was made to provide a basis for the examiner's official notice in stating that the functionality in claims 16-22 were

Art Unit: 2178

notoriously well known word processor keystroke functionalities similar to the drag and drop functionality as shown in Sugiarto. Please reference the following evidence of Microsoft Word 2000 screenshots, 12/31/99, pp. 1-9. Said screenshots showing user keystroke actions utilizing Ctrl-C (Copy), Ctrl-V (Paste), and Ctrl-X (Cut) performing the claim limitations.

Page 2: Shows a standard markup language example

Page 3: Shows selection of an element

Page 4: Shows claim 16, wherein the selected source element was moved to an absolute position using copy and paste.

Page 5: Shows claim 17, wherein the selected source element was deleted using cut.

Pages 6 & 7: Show claims 18-20, wherein a target element (Page 6) was replaced with a source element (Page 2) with the result shown on Page 7. With respect to claims 19 and 20 the elements are reversed and the target element (Page 2) changes the attributes and value of the source element (Page 6) by pasting over it.

Page 8: Shows claim 21, wherein the selected source element (Page 2) was inserted just after the start tag of the last element.

Page 9: Shows claim 22, wherein the selected source element (Page 2) was inserted just before the end tag of the second to last element.

These pages have been produced to show what was notoriously well known in the art to be associated with the keystroke induced cut, copy, and paste functionality.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2178

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER